

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the present application and indication of allowability of claims 8, 9 and 10. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-7 in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner first objects to the disclosure because paragraph 0001 included the phrase "according to the main subject of patent claim 1". This phrase has been deleted from that paragraph and thus, this objection should now be overcome.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 6 and 8-10 due to several informalities. The Examiner first requested correction of the spelling of the word "complementary". This has been complied with. In claim 1, second line, the Examiner has requested deletion of the word "the" before the word "one". This has been complied with. In claim 6, last line, the Examiner has requested deletion of "(1)" after the word "component". This has been complied with. In claim 9, at the end of the last line, a period has been inserted after the word "component" as requested by the Examiner. This has been complied with. Lastly, the Examiner has asked the Applicant to review claims 1, 8 and 10 for the insertion

of appropriate punctuation. This has been complied with.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has requested the phrase "can be" be replaced with the term "are". Applicant has replaced the phrase "can be" with "are to be" since this appeared to make more sense and be more consistent. The Examiner has also requested that the word "is" be inserted before the word "pressed". This has been complied with. Independent claims 1, 8 and 10 have been slightly rewritten to add punctuation while claim 2 has been amended to correct the insufficient antecedent basis concern raised by the Examiner with the term "the associated component".

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 as anticipated by or in the alternative, as obvious over US patent number 5,573,345 to Voss. Applicant traverses this rejection given the enclosed claim amendments. The Examiner states that the phrase "limit the impression depth" in claim 1 is subject to its broadest reasonable interpretation. In reviewing Applicant's prior arguments and amendments, the Examiner has stated that inclusion of the term "contact" to distinctly define the broad term "limit" in independent claims 8 and 10 render those claims allowable.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to also include the term "contact" and thus limiting the so-called broad term "limit" in this claim. Accordingly, claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance the same reasons as claims 8 and 10.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application and to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dieter Lange

By

  
Daniel J. Bourque, Esquire  
Registration No. 35,457  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301  
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111

Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date:

